

pro² Buchanan (Jos. R.)
Eclecticism and Exclusivism.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE,

DELIVERED IN THE FOURTH STREET CONCERT HALL,

On Wednesday evening, November 5th, 1851.

BY

JOSEPH R. BUCHANAN, M.D.,

PROFESSOR OF PHYSIOLOGY AND INSTITUTES OF MEDICINE IN THE
ECLECTIC MEDICAL INSTITUTE.

Bot 2
(PUBLISHED BY THE MEDICAL CLASS OF THE INSTITUTE.)

29245-

CINCINNATI:
PRINTED BY W. M. NAUDAIN,
CORNER VINE AND CENTRE STS.
1851.

At a meeting of the Students of the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati, held at the College Edifice November 12th, WM. CHASE was called to the Chair, and CHARLES O. MYERS appointed Secretary.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to solicit of Professor J. R. BUCHANAN a copy of his Introductory address for publication.

Whereupon, Messrs. George M. Dakin, J. Q. A. McWilliams, D. M. Keith, H. H. Smally, and D. J. Sherer, were appointed said committee.

WM. CHASE, Chairman.

C. O. MYERS, Secretary.

Cincinnati, November 12th, 1851.

PROFESSOR J. R. BUCHANAN:

Dear Sir,—Being highly pleased with the intelligible manner in which you elucidated the principles of the different systems of Medical Practice, in your Introductory Address, delivered in Fourth Street Hall, on the evening of Nov. 5th,—we as a Committee, in behalf of the Class, respectfully solicit a copy for publication.

Very respectfully, yours,

GEO. M. DAKIN,
J. Q. A. McWILLIAMS,
H. H. SMALLY,
D. M. KEITH,
D. J. SHERER.

Committee.

Cincinnati, Nov. 13th, 1851.

GENTLEMEN:

The introductory Lecture which has been favored by your approbation, was designed simply as a plain popular description of the *relative* characteristics of Eclecticism and Exclusivism. As such it is very respectfully placed at your disposal—hoping that it may assist in diffusing a knowledge of that benevolent reform in which we feel so deep an interest, and which is entitled to demand the ardent sympathies of every lover of liberality and justice.

Respectfully, and cordially, Yours,

JOS. R. BUCHANAN.

Messrs. DAKIN, McWILLIAMS, SMALLY, KEITH and SHERER,

Committee.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE.

GENTLEMEN :—

You have entered a College which professes a liberal Eclecticism—but eclecticism is not our sole characteristic. It is not merely the restrictions and despotic discipline of the old school system from which we escape—we escape far greater evils. We are proud to say, that we have abolished, so far as we are concerned, that despotic edict of the National Old School Medical Association, passed at their Philadelphia session, which prescribes that every physician shall be strictly *regular* in his practice, and follow the course laid down by his masters, or else that he and his students shall be proscribed from the ranks of the profession, and excluded ever from the privilege of attending a medical school, where such dangerous free-thinking heretics might corrupt the tender and unsophisticated lambs of their flock—it is true that we have abolished all such rules—better adapted to the government of infants than of men—but we are proud to claim something more than this. It is not enough merely to have torn off the badge of servitude, unless we have used our freedom to good purpose. It would have been no great boast for America to have thrown off the British yoke, if she had not also established a rational and prosperous republic. Eclecticism would not have been worthy of the enthusiasm it now commands, if it had not established something more than medical independence.

The very object of our independence is to be free to perform certain sacred duties—to be free to reject all the old and crumbling falsehoods of medical science, which are still upheld by authority—to be free to learn whatever Nature has to teach us—and to be free to save the lives of dying men, when we are well assured that we can do it.

First of all, we need freedom to look around, compare, and choose among the various systems, that we may escape delusion and quackery. The power of delusion is so great—its operation so extensive, and its evils have been so terrible, that I would shun as a pest-house every association for the purpose of imposing upon the young, and perpetuating the reign of error. The whole history of the world up to the present time, shows that the majority of mankind quietly yield themselves up to every form of delusion which may be prevalent in the country where they are born. Tell us in what community a man is born, and we can tell almost with certainty what principles he has adopted. In

one community he will be reared up a Roman Catholic—in another a Protestant—in another a Greek—in another a Jew—in another a Mahometan—in another a Buddhist—in another a Pagan of some specified class—taking the hue of society—imbibing every delusion which surrounds him, as the tree imbibes its sap from the soil where it is planted. And these opinions or delusions, thus passively imbibed, are not established because they have gained currency by specious arguments and established facts. They are established in many cases by conspiracies against the people—by strong associations, or by the strong hand of military power. The religion of the people throughout Europe has been dictated to them at the point of the bayonet—the church is everywhere upheld by the sword, and all the great fundamental principles for the regulation of human life and society, have been propagated and maintained by powder and ball—by the sword and bayonet. A few successful battles decide for ages to come what the unborn millions shall believe. At present, in Europe and America, various forms of Christianity are professed; but that we are called Christians—that we are not repeating prayers with our faces turned to Mecca, is probably only because in the eighth century, the Catholic armies were more powerful than those of the Mahometans—because Charles Martel, the Mayor of France, in the great battle on the plains of Poitiers in 732, succeeded in driving back in defeat the hordes of Saracen invaders, whose armies threatened at that time to conquer all Europe.

That man should thus be the passive creature of circumstances, believing absolutely, whatever a king shall decree to be true—that a whole nation of conscious, intelligent beings should accept with all the fervor of their souls, whatever has been arranged for them to believe, by kings, and priests, and soldiers—is one of the most melancholy and humiliating facts of history. The combined leaders of mankind have looked upon the masses, heretofore, as mere puppets to be moved at the word of command. And the policy of thus organizing a faith for the people and managing the multitude by force of authoritative associations, has pervaded Europe and attaches to all that we have borrowed from Europe.

We have borrowed from Europe a medical profession, with a certain set of ideas, a certain literature, a certain organization, sentiments and *esprit du corps*. This profession has been transplanted bodily from the foul and artificial soil of Europe, to the free soil of America—transplanted, without being transformed—it lives and flourishes here as an exotic, for it has nothing in common with the free spirit of our country, and has never been Americanized.

In this profession the influence of Europe still lives—the idea is still acted upon, that the leaders must think for the masses, and

that the AUTHORITIES of the profession must be obeyed by its humbler members, or their decrees enforced by a sentence of excommunication. With what success have these assumptions been maintained? I am sorry to say, the democratic republican spirit of America, has not maintained its honor in this field. The colleges, and medical societies, have been allowed to prescribe a creed for the entire profession, and this form of government has in the main been loyally supported until the great Eclectic rebellion, which bids fair to become a national revolution.

It may be asked how can the despotism of a profession be maintained in this free country? How can a dangerous and absurd delusion be perpetuated when there is no military or political power to keep it up? Modern researches in the science of man, have shown us very plainly how easy it is to perpetuate an imposition by a proper organization. The mesmeric power of mind over mind, under proper circumstances is perfectly despotic. I have seen a Mesmeric operator before a public audience call up clergymen, and after getting the control of his mind, make him renounce his faith, and profess to be alternately a Methodist, or Universalist, just as his operator wished. I have seen stout intelligent men standing up in long array before the audience, made to believe anything, or perform any part in the farce dictated by their Mermerizer,—and some of you may recollect seeing one of the most intelligent members of the class on the platform, made to believe any and every story that was told him with the most implicit faith. Such facts are familiar to you all.

We know, therefore, that in order to perpetuate any delusion it is only necessary that we select the proper impressible subjects, keep them in a passive state, stamp the delusion on their minds and keep it there until it has taken firm hold, and become a second nature. Then you will see your wretched dupe exulting in the possession of truth, and resenting with indignation the idea, that he has been made an instrument by designing men.

Thus we observe our medical schools receiving their young impressible subjects from the country, who are previously told that they must follow their great authorities, and submit with docility to all their instructions. They find themselves in the ranks, of a well disciplined profession, where the subordinates look up to the leaders for the word of command—surrounded by the imposing influences of flourishing colleges and a public sentiment, from which none can escape. Passively instructed from day to day by his superiors in learning—anxious to win their approbation and the student fearful of failure—surrenders at discretion, and yields his whole soul to the guidance of his teachers. He hears no manly sentiments in behalf of free independent investigation. He is told to reverence the learned authorities—Like the bird that is charmed by a serpent to its destruction—his

eye is fastened and fascinated. He is required to gaze steadily at his mesmeric master—to confine his studies to orthodox teaching. If he ventures to spend a few months in the office of an independent physician, he is told that he has become a suspicious character himself, and must be excluded from college privileges. If he ventures to attend the lectures of an Eclectic professor, he is soon secretly denounced as a traitor, and either refused a diploma or openly insulted by some of his associates. If he feels some curiosity to look beyond the stone walls of Allopathy, he is told that Homœopathy, is too silly to merit a moment's notice, and that there is nothing in it but humbug and fraud. If he wishes to test by practical trial the merits of Homœopathy or Eclecticism, he is given to understand that his course is suspicious, and disreputable. In short, by means of ridicule, censure and the mighty mesmeric power of numbers, he is prevented from ever looking beyond the prescribed limits, and his eyes are fastened on the great dogmas of the party until he becomes as perfectly a mesmerized subject as any that are exhibited on the platform.

Do you not observe this to be true? Do you not observe the pupils of the different schools—following in the footsteps of their teachers; did we not observe the graduates of a few years since, dealing out teaspoonful doses of calomel? Do we not observe that throughout the country—if you know in what school a doctor was manufactured you can tell very nearly what notions he has, and what practice he will adopt? Does not the medical profession handle its young subjects as though they were clay in the hands of the potter, to be moulded into shape? Such at least is my philosophy of medical delusion and quackery.

We teach like all other schools a system of science and practice, but a system developed and established under the guidance of liberal principles. Unlike all other systems, ours is Eclectic, and not exclusive. When we have related the best rules and demonstrated the most comprehensive principles, we do not require you to believe that all beyond the range of our instructions is folly and imposture. We cheerfully acknowledge the merit and the truth that may be found in all the systems of practice and doctrine now in vogue—but we cannot consent to identify ourselves with any exclusive system, however great its merit may be. Even if our Eclectic territory was as barren as the northernmost hills of Scotland, we could cling to it as the territory of the free. But such is not the case—Eclecticism is a fertile region, prolific of resources, some which are peculiar to itself. The Eclectic physician is not content with the usual resources of medicine—he requires a new class of Apothecary's Halls to furnish the resources that he demands.

I have not time this evening to compare the resources of Eclecticism with the resources of other systems—to show the su-

periority of our Surgery and medical practice—to show the superior results of Eclecticism in cancerous and fistulous diseases, in spinal diseases, malignant growths, and ophthalmic affections—to show the contrast, like day and night, between the Eclectic and old school practice, in Cholera, in Puerperal fever, in common Billious fever, in Pneumonia, and in Rheumatism—nor to show the great superiority of our *Materia Medica*, of the Podophyllin, Leptandrin, Macrotin, Cypripedin, and twenty other concentrated agents. I leave these to our future course ; and I would speak at present, not of the contrast between the Eclectic and the old school system, but of the superiority of the liberal policy of ECLECTICISM over all forms of EXCLUSIVISM.

The systems of practice now claiming our attention are the Allopathic, Homœopathic, Hydropathic, Botanic and Chrono-Thermal. When the question is proposed to a young man whether to unite with one of these exclusive systems, or with the American Eclectic Association, he would naturally, in the first instance, ask where he would obtain the amplest resources for the treatment of disease, and where he would most assuredly retain his mental independence, and escape the influence of medical delusion and bigotry. We claim for Eclecticism the amplest resources, because, in the first place, it has the best resources, many of which are not in the hands of other parties, in daily use, and in the second place, it has an unlimited range of selection. But without arguing this question at present, I ask whether we may not justly claim to be free from the delusions that belong to exclusivism, and whether all these systems of exclusivism are not characterised by errors and delusions, which should induce us to shun their embraces, even if they were competent to furnish the necessary resources.

To take them up in the inverse order of their importance, Chrono-Thermalism can scarcely claim a position yet among the great systems—based, as it is, upon the single idea that morbid action observes a law of periodicity. Its scope is too limited to effect a thorough reform of the old system. In abolishing the lancet, and changing the details of practice, it has done much good ; but while its followers are liable to exaggerate the importance of its one great idea, I am not aware that they contemplate a very radical reform of the bigotry and false principles of the old school. We may accept Chrono-Thermalism as an interesting contribution to medical science—to accept it as anything more would mislead our attention from matters of greater moment.

Next we have a party of chameleon name, changing its hues and titles like the dying dolphin, which we may term the Botanic. From the useless learning and destructive practice of the old school, it was a natural reaction which brought out the ignorance, the common sense, and the useful medicines of Samuel Thompson. His limited pharmacopœia and universal application of

steam, originated the designation of Steamers or Thomsonians. It cannot be denied that they accomplished many cures which were beyond the reach of old school practitioners. The tree of medical science was so barren, that when Thomson, instead of trimming it into shape, chopped it down with his broad-axe, his followers were not conscious of any fatal loss.

In an enlightened country, the ignorance and limited resources of Thomsonism could not long maintain a hold on the public confidence,—especially, when scientific physicians were at the same time prosecuting a rational conservative reform—the germ of our present Eclecticism.

Hence, the Thomsonian or Steam system, from its first origin, has been hopefully growing and improving, beyond the ideas of Thomson. Rising above the titles of Steamers and Thomsonians, the system was designated as *Botanico-Medical*; and medical schools were acknowledged to be necessary and useful. Botanico-Medicalism appeared to stand about half way between original simon-pure Thomsonism, and a rational Eclecticism. Teaching, studying, and practicing medical science, could not fail to have a happy influence upon this movement; and, accordingly, we find the Botanico-Medicals advancing still further beyond Thomsonism, enlarging their resources, and using the principal means of Eclecticism, but still making an outcry against a portion of the resources retained by Eclectics, denouncing them as poison unfit to be retained in the official list. Perceiving that medicine could not rely upon vegetable remedies exclusively, and that all minerals were not as bad as Thomson supposed, the title of Botanico-Medical was dropped, and that of Physo-Medical substituted. This title, however, was rather awkwardly constructed, as *Physo* signifies air, or wind; and a *Physo-Medical* system must, therefore, be rather too gaseous for solidity or dignity. Since this defect was pointed out, *Physo-Medical* is in danger of being laid on the shelf with *Steam*, *Thomsonian*, and *Botanico-Medical*;—the word *Physo-Pathic* is taking its place; but, as this signifies a windy disease, or windy treatment, suggesting painful and cholicky ideas, I do not perceive that it is much improved. The word aimed at, *Phusis*, or *Physis*, is Anglicised *Physi*, as in *Physiology*. Hence, the last announcement I have seen makes it *Physi-o-medical*. The subject has been greatly discussed of late; some recommend *Physio-pathic*, some *Physo-Anti-pathic*, and some *Physio-Anti-pathic*. In the multitude of counsellors, there is safety. Some simplify the title of the party by calling them the *Physo*s; and the wags have suggested that, if there is too much tinkering with *Physi*, it may assume a still more ludicrous termination.

I am really afraid the people will never catch up with the transformations of the *Phyz.*, or *Phiz.*, or *Phus.*,—they will hardly know whether to call it *Phy-so*, or *Phys-o*, or *Phy-sio*, or *Phys-io*,

or Phy-si, or Phys-i, or Phu-si, or Phus-i. In fact, the physiognomy of the whole etymology is as quizzical and farcical as anything that ever emanated from *physic*.

Laying aside these verbal matters, let us hope that this progressive party will get a respectable name in time. As to their principles, I presume when they are fully developed, and their resources properly arrayed, they will not differ very materially from Eclectic Reformers. But, for some time past, the idea was held out that no medicine should ever be used which is not perfectly safe, and incapable of acting as a poison. The non-poison platform was boasted of, and Eclectics were denounced for using poisons. Now, if such a party would adhere to cold bread and tepid water as their sole medicines, there would be a sublime consistency in their doctrines and practice. But when many of the drugs which they use are capable of killing even a well man in a short time, their theory becomes palpably absurd and inconsistent.

The non-poison theory would confine us to food and water. By medicine we mean something not used as food, but designed to modify the vital functions. Now, there is no such substance in nature, which is not poisonous or destructive, if used with sufficient freedom. The distinction between medicines and poisons, is merely a distinction of degree, not of kind. Any medicine, if sufficiently concentrated, would be called a poison, and any poison sufficiently sub-divided or diffused, may act as a medicine. Snake poison is converted into a medicine by Homœopaths; and the most harmless medicines would be pronounced poisons, if we could concentrate their energy, until a single grain would be a fatal dose.

The idea that a medicine is desirable, merely because it can be given in a large dose, or that it is unfit to be used because it must be used in a small dose, is a very crude theory, indeed, and indicates a very mechanical mode of thinking. The only proper criterion for adopting or rejecting a medicine, is the question whether its tendency in any given case, is to produce good or bad effects. This is the rule of common sense, and the rule of Eclecticism. If a medicine in any given case is beneficial and safe, use it—if not, reject it. If beneficial, the small dose is no objection; for it is vastly more convenient to carry an ample supply in a small pocket vial, than to carry in an armful of herbs, and a kettle to boil them. If one fourth of a grain be a sufficient dose; and, if twenty grains being 80 full doses, would have sufficient power to destroy life, this constitutes no objection if the quarter grain dose be really safe and beneficial. As well might we object to putting mustard and pepper on our meat, because a large dose might produce dangerous inflammation of the stomach.

It is right to reject everything which operates harshly, and gen-

erally produces ill effects; but the Botanico-Medical party have gone beyond these legitimate limits by rejecting articles which, in their legitimate use, are safe and beneficial; and some of the members of this party, in times past, have manifested as narrow, dogmatical, and exclusive a spirit as the leaders of old school medicine. In the present transition stage, I would merely say, that I rejoice in their progress, and believe that they have done much good, although they have carried a reformatory principle to a most unwise extravagance; which study, experience, and time, will doubtless correct. Notwithstanding all that has occurred in the past, I feel disposed to co-operate in a hearty and friendly manner with all ultra botanic reformers, whatever kind of a Phys they may prefix to their name. The circular of the present Physopathic School avows similar principles to those which have been so often set forth by Eclectic Reformers:

"It is not bound down to the dogmas and teachings of any man or any sect, but approves of truth wherever found. It cherishes all due respect for the cultivators of medical science of every name and order, adopting, however, into its own teachings and practices only such facts as perfectly harmonize with our great fundamental principle, INNOCENT MEDICATION.

"We desire to be co-workers with all respectable medical schools of whatever name or order, in bringing the science of medicine to as great perfection as may be, and rendering practical medicine as safe and efficient as possible in the restoration from disease, and the preservation of the health of our fellow-beings. With such views and feelings we extend the right hand of fellowship to our medical brethren of every name, reserving to ourselves the privilege of strict adherence to an innocent and efficient medication."

If these principles are fully carried out in practice, we can accept with cordiality the "right hand of fellowship."

The Hydropathic or Water-Cure treatment is one of great merit—one which should be incorporated among the resources of every enlightened physician; but when water is made the sole agent in the treatment, and when a system of exclusiveness is built up professing a hearty contempt and scorn for all other remedial resources, and instilling unwarrantable prejudices into the public mind against all medicines whatever, we have reason to rejoice that we are Eclectics, but that we do not submit our minds to this form of delusion and prejudice. If we must be narrow-minded—if we must dwell upon one idea alone, because we have not room in our minds for more—water is as good a hobby, perhaps, as any other. Indeed, it is, in all probability, the best.

But what is the necessity for intelligent men thus to surrender their general knowledge and resources. We might as well resolve to live upon one article of food, as bread, or potatoes, or

rice, or corn, or oats, as to confine ourselves to one medicine. No doubt a water-cure system will cure a great number of diseases; and so will a

Lobelia-cure system, or a
Podophyllin-cure system, or a
Calomel-cure system, or a
Steam-cure system, or a
Brandy and Salt-cure system.

Thus, every doctor might have his hobby—his one great cure-all; and there is no doubt that any single, valuable drug in the whole *materia medica* would cure an immense amount of disease, if we made a hobby of it. And, gentlemen, you can make a hobby of almost anything, and make some progress on it, too, if you push on with energy and enthusiasm. But I believe, of all the individual hobbies now bestrode in this country, the water-cure hobby is decidedly the best. I rejoice in the progress of the water-cure, and when the water-cure system becomes a substitute for a calomel-cure system, it will be a change for the better: as if, from a Devil of Darkness to an Angel of Light.

There is another hobby upon which very respectable progress may be made, and which, like Hydropathy, is doing a world of good in substituting safe agencies for the destructive operations of old Medicine—Homœopathy, or, practically speaking, the use of infinitesimal doses, is an innovation of great merit; and, if it were merely added to the common stock of science, I would say to Homœopathy as to Hydropathy, welcome! welcome! we rejoice to receive your co-operation in the great work of medical reform! But, unfortunately, these two worthy new comers, after having been for some time kicked out of the Temple of Esculapius by the masters of old medicine, have got their spirit up, and resolved, each of them, that they will not only make way into the temple where they have a right to be, but will also reciprocate favors by kicking every body else out, and taking exclusive possession. Now, against this I protest—I vote for the admission of Homœopathy and Hydropathy—let them come in and occupy as much ground as they can really cover; but I protest they shall not turn out any body, or any thing. When they reciprocate the arrogance of Old Hunkerism by the rival arrogance of Young Hunkerism, they provoke our criticism; we are tempted to ask, what is this new infallible system, which is to supercede everything else, and fill the whole temple of Esculapius. But before I commence these criticisms, I must protest that I make them in no unfriendly spirit. I entertain a sincere regard both for Homœopathy, as a contribution to medical science, and for Homœopathic physicians as enlightened and intellectual men. But when they come with the demand that we shall surrender at discretion—give up our arms upon which we rely, I beg leave to look at their documents, and see if they have any right to make such a demand.

*Practically speaking** Homœopathy demands that you shall lay aside vigorous potential doses of drugs, and shall consent to use only little globules of sugar of milk, which have no medicine in them that can be detected by a chemist. Neither can you detect any medicine in them by taste or by smell—but by a process of reasoning you can discover that it ought to be there—because the sugar has been in a mortar in company with the physic, and might have got infected with the qualities of the medicine. If you would hold a small lump of loaf sugar for one minute over a vial of cologne or of linseed oil, and then swallow the sugar, you would get more than a Homœopathic dose.

I shall not deny that homœopathic physicians have effected cures; but that does not authorize them to demand that we shall lay aside our efficient means, and adopt those which are so feeble as the infinitesimals. We know that we can cure by doses, that we see, and feel, and taste, and which produce plain intelligible and powerful effects in accordance with common sense, and sound philosophy, and we will not give up a sure reliance for the speculative beauties of Homœopathy.

Supposing that these infinitesimal globules and tinctures, (tinctures did I say—about as strong as a spoonful of salt in the Ohio River,) supposing that these essences, shadows and ghosts of departed medicine had all the power ascribed to them—what is that power? Nothing at all, upon a healthy constitution. A lively baby will swallow the whole contents of the Homœopathic Laboratory—a hundred pills of a hundred different kinds of medicine, making ten thousand doses and will not distinguish any difference of effects from those of common sugar candy.

But it is contended that although these doses are entirely inoperative upon those in health, yet if given to the diseased, and if adapted to the disease with sufficient nicety and precision, all the symptoms of the medicine, corresponding to all the symptoms of the disease, they will be certain to cure or benefit the patient. This is very much like killing a giant by thrusting a long needle through his eye into his brain, while the anti-pathic practice would rather kill him by crushing his head with the blow of a battle-axe.

This very delicate and wonderful method of overcoming disease by the ghosts of Aconite, Mercury and Belladonna &c., is

*It is true that *philosophically* speaking, one may adopt the *Homœopathic* principle, without confining himself to infinitesimal doses; but as those who adopt the Homœopathic practice, do adopt these attenuated doses, which are the *principal reliance* of Homœopathic physicians we may with great propriety say, that the *practical* question is whether we shall use sensible or insensible doses. That a few Homœopathic physicians discard the rules of Hahnemann, and use very sensible doses, does not change the aspect of the question—as we cannot yet consider them the leading or authoritative representatives of the system. I speak of Hahnemanic Homœopathy, not of rational or eclectic Homœopathy.

really marvelous. The spirits of departed medicines, which are quite invisible and imperceptible to the healthy, are supposed to become real *spiritual rappers*, whenever they are properly fitted to a disease. But how to fit them is rather a delicate affair.

Delicate operations are very liable to miscarry. A learned Homœopathic author declares that he would have cured one of his patients of an attack of pneumœnia, but for the fact that he had a hollow tooth, and the little sugar globule got into the hollow tooth and lodged there, instead of performing its great mission to cure the lungs.

Moreover these little globules may be infected by bad smells, and their whole medicinal virtue destroyed. For there is vastly more virtue in a good smell than in a homœopathic dose. There is not as much medicine in a vial of homœopathic globules as you would have in a pocket vial of sugar, or charcoal, or sawdust, if you would take out the cork and let it stand a few hours inverted over one of Mr. Merrell's jars of active medicine. One good smell of an efficient dose, will convey more medicine into your system than all the Homœopathic doses given from the beginning to the end of your disease. It has been the fashion to express our contempt for anything by saying that it was not worth a pinch of snuff; but the Homœopathic doses are worth less than that, for they are not equal to one good smell at a pinch of snuff. Homœopaths themselves being aware that a smell is more than a dose, would not make use of their globules if they were prepared in an apothecary's shop where the various odors might contaminate their sugar.

These may be delicate notions gentlemen: the very essence of medical refinement and spirituality, but Homœopathy has something far more delicate than this. A smell is altogether too much. A homœopathic physician will very seriously caution his patients against smelling a flower, lest the smell should overpower his medicine. And Hahnemann, the great God of Homœopathy, thinks the smell of a gross medicine, altogether too powerful for his patients. Accordingly he directs them to put a few Homœopathic globules in a vial—globules in which you can neither smell nor taste anything but sugar; and hold the vial under the patients nose, two or three times a day. You might suppose that this was a burlesque, but no, it is sound authentic Homœopathy from the great founder of the system.

The shadow of a ghost is not more delicate and imperceptible than the high refinements of Homœopathy. If you should place a copper cent in your mouth for one second, and then return it to your pocket, there is more copper left upon the point of your tongue than a Homœopathic physician would consider necessary to treat a dozen cases of cholera. The wonderful powers ascribed to their doses are supposed to be developed by rubbing—

by trituration in a mortar, or shaking in a vial. How a medicine is to be improved by shaking, has never been explained. (If you were to shake the patient, it might do him some good.) Hahnemann declares that he rendered his medicines very powerful by shaking them—the longer he shook them, the more he stirred up their wonderful powers, until by hard shaking they became so furiously powerful as to endanger the lives of his patients, and he was compelled to reduce the number of his shakings from ten shakes to two.

This Hahnemann is the very God of Homœopathic idolatry. To deviate from his dicta has been considered quackery : but I ask you, soberly, can such a man be a competent guide in so profound and difficult a science as medicine? Are you willing to give your faith to him—to surrender all freedom of inquiry—to lay aside everything but what he allows, and to swallow by wholesale a system of doctrines developed by him, of a crude and unsatisfactory character, concerning which, you cannot find in all his writings a reasonable or satisfactory explanation. Hahnemann cannot be allowed to rank with Bacon, Gall and Newton, as his admirers imagine ; for he was entirely unable to give a satisfactory rational explanation even of his own theory.

We therefore calmly decide, after listening to all the Homœopathic arguments and seductions, that all that can possibly be said in favor of the infinitesimally tintured globules of sugar of milk, does not prove to us that we ought to give up the plain intelligible and successful methods of treating disease with which we are acquainted. I would, with a hearty good will, assist Homœopathic investigations, and protect them from the insolence and slanders of old fashioned Allopathy—but I cannot carry my sympathy so far as to surrender my independent judgment to the mere arbitrary dicta of a cloudily speculative physician—a German dogmatist, who fancies because he has brought forward a new idea—which, however, was originated long before his time—which, in fact, is found in the writings of Hippocrates—that everything else accumulated by the therapeutic experience of ages, must be swept aside to allow his new principle sufficient room to display its beauty.

This is a very common course. Old Hunkers are not the only class of narrow minded men. It very often happens that a scientific or political reformer becomes enamored of some single idea, and fails to embrace in his comprehension other equally valuable truths. It very often happens that such men insist that everything else but their own intellectual property shall be swept away, in order that they may be recognised as the great founders of science, who have converted night and chaos into daylight and order.

I consider it degrading to the dignity of an independent mind to submit to the claims of such usurpers—men who have a cer-

tain amount of territory which is their own, but who wish to annex "all creation" to their own kingdom. Let Hahnemann stand on the merits of his own globules, as an eminent contributor to science, and not attempt to exclaim, like the boastful quack Paracelsus,—“The monarchy of Physic is mine.” There is no monarchy in medicine—there has been no master mind—no master builder. We are all but journeymen mechanics, working slowly—each bringing up a few bricks and a little mortar—some doing good work and some bad. We have been working twenty-three centuries, and not yet half built the temple of Esculapius. That man who would claim to be the builder of the temple would be an impostor.

How much more respectable is a comprehensive Eclectic reform than any one idea reform. Take up the no poison theory, the cold water theory, or the infinitesimal theory, and at once you find a large portion of your resources cut off, not because they are intrinsically evil, not because they produce bad effects as you use them, but simply because they do not accord with an exclusive and dogmatic theory.

I protest against cutting off any of our resources; water, potential concentrated drugs, infinitesimals, medicated sugar, galvanism, animal magnetism, and all the can possibly use with benefit, we should retain; and whenever we resign our freedom of choice and abandon valuable resources by joining any bigoted proscriptive party, we lower our own dignity as much as we diminish our usefulness.

Let us proscribe nothing, reject nothing which we can make beneficial. Let us keep free of all proscriptive parties, but retain all they respectively possess. Let us become neither Thomsonians nor Preissnitzians, nor Hahnemannians, but enlightened medical gentlemen who think for ourselves and “call no man master.” We have endeavored to embrace these specialties in our course—we have endeavored to include Homœopathy among the professorships of the school, and we would have continued the experiment but for two very good reasons expressed by the words *laborious* and *incompatible*. It was too laborious for the student during the short time devoted to study to master two different systems of practice. If he would study five years it could be done, but as time is limited, and it is impossible for us to go over the whole Cyclopædia of medical science, we concluded to attempt only what we could and to teach one system thoroughly rather than two systems imperfectly. Thus we teach as much as is necessary to good practice, leaving more extensive acquisition to future study.

Another reason was that Homœopathy, as taught by an exclusive Homœopathic physician, is incompatible with the spirit of our school—it is anti-Eclectic. Its teachers claim that Eclecticism is false, delusive, unscientific—that their rule, “*similia*

similibus curantur” comprises the sum total of medical wisdom, and that a Homœopathic chair in an Eclectic school is a single flash of light amid midnight darkness. Eclecticism magnanimously tolerated this. When Homœopathy was driven in scorn from every medical college and medical society in the United States, as a system of imposture and quackery, Eclecticism opened wide its doors to the persecuted stranger, and welcomed it in. What gratitude did we receive? I would not blame the courteous and urbane follower of Hahnemann whom we received, for he was more liberal than others; but I must mention the fact that his lectures, instead of being confined to the presentation of his own practice, were largely occupied in attempting to prove the folly and falsity of everything else but Homœopathy.

Believing that error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free, we not only tolerated this—not only permitted a stranger of a hostile party to occupy our halls, in assailing all the valuable truths that we taught, but gave all our moral support in securing respectful attention to his arguments—and more than all this, so desirous were we to give a hospitable reception, that we neither answered the attacks nor refuted the errors that were put forth. In this I think we went beyond strict justice, and were altogether *too generous*. But if we were too generous, we felt that we could afford it—and we are proud to say, that the entire annals of medicine may be searched in vain for a similar example of liberality.

Finding that the value of our course of instruction was impaired—having too many professorships—imposing too much on students, and exhausting their health, by crowding their studies, so that in learning one portion they neglected others—it became necessary to retrench for the welfare of the school; and as we could not retrench any portion of our Eclectic course, it became our duty to cut off the excrescence engrafted upon it, and throw aside a professorship which introduced an anti-Eclectic spirit—a spirit of exclusivism and ultraism, and which we could not, in strict justice, tolerate, without refuting its errors, and thus maintaining a dissension and discord between the different professorships, which would still further divert attention from useful studies, and mar the harmony of our school. Could the useful truths of Homœopathy be selected, and presented in a plain practical manner, without exclusiveness and absurd Hahnemannian theories, and without occupying too much space in our course, I believe it would be a valuable addition, and this is all that I ever thought it judicious to do—but in the generosity of my colleagues, more was proposed and done; but my first opinion was verified by the result. Although we exposed ourselves to ridicule and denunciation by our Homœopathic chair, our overdone liberality was received by the Homœopathic fraternity without thanks. And even the Homœopathic professor was censured for violating the

intolerance and exclusiveness of his party by teaching in an Eclectic school. What would you say if a Presbyterian clergyman, who had no congregation of his own, had been invited to preach in a Universalist pulpit, and had had gone there to preach up Presbyterianism, and preach down Universalism—what would you say if his fellow Presbyterians instead of thanking him, should pass a vote of censure against his course, because he was not sufficiently exclusive, and did not confine his lectures to Presbyterians? What would you think of the Universalists if they should continue to give their church gratuitously to their assailant, at their own inconvenience and expense, while their generosity was ridiculed and condemned by the Presbyterian body, and not a single Universalist would be tolerated in their halls?

Two Christian churches never could act thus, in violation of common sense and common liberality; but such was the relative course of Homœopathy and Eclecticism.

But we shall have no more of it! Henceforth we shall have no propagandist of dogmatic and exclusive doctrines. No devoted follower of any single leader. We shall worship the God of truth alone, and we shall have no altars nor statues in our church to St. Thomson, St. Priessnitz, and St. Hahnemann. And fervently do we hope that those who have been engaged in such idolatry will abandon their respective idols, and unite in adoring the one God of Truth.

We hope that they will lay aside their different forms of extravagance and ultraism, and come forward in a spirit of harmony, with their unquestionable merits, and truths, and talents, to co-operate in destroying old and pernicious errors, and to aid each other in attaining the great common end and aim of all medical reformers, in a safe and successful system of treatment. There are obvious indications of such a co-operation, for the active minds of the different parties are already laying aside the dicta of their original leaders, and recognizing the necessity of more enlarged views. By the efforts of such minds, the great stream of reform will sweep on to the next century, blending in one great current, many converging streams.

Having discussed the minor systems of medical delusion and bigotry, we now proceed to consider the great and ancient system of old school Allopathy; which towers above all other forms of medical delusion and bigotry as the Mammoth Mastodon and Megalonyx of the primeval ages of the world, tower above our modern brutes.

I do not mean that the mass of medical science is a mass of falsehood or delusion; on the contrary, the great mass of medical science which is common to all schools, is a mass of unquestionable facts laboriously gathered, constituting an indestructible, eternal foundation upon which theoretical superstructures may be reared. He who, in denouncing medical follies, denounces the entire science of medicine, only shows his own ignorance or

recklessness. When I speak of the different schools of medicine, I speak not of that elaborate mass of science which is common to all of them—the facts of Chemistry, Botany, Anatomy, Pathology, Operative Surgery, Obstetrics, and Materia Medica; but merely of that which is distinctive and peculiar in each system—the peculiar course of therapeutics, and the peculiar ethical doctrines, and general spirit, and policy.

When, therefore, I say, that old school Allopathy is a monstrous system of delusion and mischief, I do not mean the entire course of collegiate lectures, or medical practice, but the *peculiar* doctrines, and *peculiar* professional spirit and organization, by which the old system is distinguished from the new. I cannot say that my friends who teach and practice the old school system are engaged in a system of delusion and falsehood; but I do say, that along with the valuable science and practice of medicine, they have incorporated an amount of practical errors and unsound principles, which have been, and are, a curse to the human race. The different parties in medicine, like the different sects in Christianity, have a great common stock of knowledge and doctrines about which they do not dispute; but when errors are engrafted upon these which seriously diminish the value of the whole, it is our duty to reform; and *the difference between the conservatives and reformers lies simply in these abuses which we desire to extirpate.*

Medicine is like the fashionable sedentary patient; it has been confined so long to the house as to have almost lost the use of its legs. Busy in reading old books it has neglected nature, and while there are at least twenty thousand valuable medicines in nature which have never been used by man, physicians have neglected their study to read old volumes of a worthless speculation. Our historians say that for fifteen hundred years the writings of Galen swayed the whole medical profession as the absolute supreme *authority*. Yet at this time his productions are really not worth the care it would require to read them. They are buried on the shores of the sea of oblivion, and are disinterred only occasionally by antiquarians from motives of curiosity. Up to the present day, the study of antique rubbish has been so much the fashion, that we know comparatively little of nature, little of the vast resources for the healing of disease.

It is often an idle boast of the advocates of Old-Medicine that it is a science of two or three thousand years establishment, and that doctrines twenty or thirty centuries old are not to be openly insulted and defied by modern vagaries of the last twenty-five years. Such an argument is an insult to our intelligence. In the first place it is essentially false; in the second place if it were true, it would be ridiculous; and in the third place some of the leading ideas of Eclecticism are older than the leading ideas of Hunkerism: in the fourth place the whole discussion about antiquity is entirely irrelevant as it has nothing to do with the truth or value of the two systems.

Suppose it were true that our present old school system was really one thousand, or two thousand, or three thousand years old, would not that be a sufficient proof that it was a gigantic imposition, that it was behind the intelligence of the times, and ought to be abolished at once? If our present professors are really teaching the same stupid follies, the same false and inefficient practice, the same ridiculous physiology as Galen, Aris- totle, and Hippocrates, they are a disgrace to the age. Does any one now a days teach that the arteries carry air? Such was the anatomy of the ancients—that nerves and tendons are the same, that the brain contracts and expands, so as to inspire and expire through the nose, that the bile flows from the gall bladder to the liver, and phlegm flows to the head, or that blood is formed by the liver. Does any one teach that fevers are to be cured by keeping the patient in bed, with blankets, closed doors, and windows, and hot fires, and heating drinks for days or weeks? Yet such was the practice based upon the rules of Hippocrates, which was pursued down to the latter part of the last century.

Gentlemen—if old medicine can claim an antiquity of the twenty or thirty centuries, it is a base imposition on human intelligence. But it has no such claims. The great portion of modern practice is scarcely one century old, and as it is a considerable portion of it, old enough already to be obsolete. The most valuable things in science are generally the newest and most recent. If I wished to boast of a medical system, I should boast that it belonged not to the dark ages of superstition and ignorance, but to the present enlightened period—not that it was old but that it was young. Let Hunkerism boast of age, Eclecticism boasts of youth. Was the use of ether and chloroform, derived from Galen and Hippocrates? Was the demonstration that all diseases could be treated without the lancet an ancient or a modern demonstration? Was vaccination due to the ancients or the moderns? Do we get our anatomy, our physiology and our chemistry from the ancients or the moderns? Do you not know that the latest works are the best and supersede every thing before them? Did we know the functions of the brain, until fifty or sixty years ago? Did we know how to operate upon the brain, or did we understand the philosophy of its operations on the body, until the last ten years? What is there in our science which is really great or valuable that is not modern? He who boasts of antiquity is really boasting of his ignorance, boasting that he is behind the age. A medical system in boasting of its birth should rather claim that it originated in the 'age of free intellect—the age of steam engines, steamboats, railroads, telegraphs—the age of great republics, the age of progressive science, the age of great reforms, revolutions and gigantic ideas.

But if any one wishes to boast of the antiquity of his system,

let him indulge his fancy. The wisdom of his boast is best illustrated by the fable of the donkey mail carrier.

The story runs that a venerable donkey travelled along a muddy road upon the margin of a beautiful river, staggering under the weight of the mail bags on his back. A spirited young horse dashing by, paused a moment, and feeling a compassion for the venerable years and hard labor of the donkey, ventured to address him, asking why, at his advanced age, he should be toiling along, slowly and laboriously, under such a load, when he might easily, by going on board the splendid steamboat just hurrying by, be carried with his heavy load in the speediest and most comfortable manner to his destination.

Sir, replied the donkey, how long has this new method of carrying the mail been practised? Probably not more than twenty-five or thirty years, was the reply of the horse. Thirty years! said the donkey contemptuously; and how long do you suppose that my method of carrying the mail has been established? Do you not know that my method is three thousand years old? Do you not know that the wisest and most learned men, and the greatest rulers of the land, for three thousand years have been sending their letters by my ancient and honorable method? And have you the insolence to ask me to lay aside this wise old method for your new-fangled quackery, scarcely thirty years old? Sir, it is an insult to my dignity, and I assure you *no respectable donkey* would ever listen to such an absurdity!!

The claim of antiquity being both false and ridiculous, is also irrelevant—the only question between us is whether the American Eclectic practice or the old Mercurial practice is *the best*—as for age—the older a thing may be in science, the greater probability that it is false. But in ethics it is otherwise—the moral sentiments do not depend upon learning—the ancients had as sublime ideas of virtue as the moderns—and in simple, plain, practical questions their judgment was perhaps as good.

The cardinal principle of Eclecticism—that truth should be sought from every source—that all men and all systems have some truth in them which we should seek and appropriate, is a dictate of common sense and the moral sentiments—the sentiments of justice and liberality. As this is not a matter of progressive science but a plain ethical principle, the ancients were as likely to be right as the moderns, and therefore I am not ashamed to say that, our Eclectic liberality may claim the sanction of ancient writers.

In the first and second centuries of the Christian era, the principle of Eclecticism in the gathering of medical truth was extensively acknowledged. Galen, the great leader of the profession avowed a disposition to be Eclectic, but like some modern physicians claiming to be Eclectic, he was the reverse—for he confined himself chiefly to criticisms on the writings of Hippocrates.

But other eminent physicians were distinctly known as Eclectics, and ARCHIGENES OF APAMEA was recognized as the leader of the Eclectics of that age. His writings of course would be of little value now, but they were among the foremost of the age—and the learned Haller recommends him highly as an able author on all the departments of medicine.

Another great party in that day was substantially the same as the Eclectics—they were the EPISYNTHETICS, led by Leonides of Alexandria, who endeavored to bring together as far as possible, and reconcile the various discordant opinions of different authors. When we established a Homœopathic Professorship, we were pursuing the policy of the Episynthetics, but unfortunately we had not their cooperation in that movement.

Another party in ancient times, which attended to the spiritual and subtle forces, correspond somewhat to the Mesmeric and spiritual party of modern times—the PNEUMATICS. They were led by Athenous of Attalia, who was pronounced by Galen the most polished systematiser of the age, and who was followed by many of the most eminent physicians including Archigenes, Herodotus and others.

It is plain, therefore, that the liberal principles of modern times were acknowledged by the conscience and common sense of the early writers on medicine, and had these liberal principles been followed, instead of falling down and worshipping the writings of Galen, who was distinguished more for his lively and speculative fancy than for inductive research we might have been advanced centuries further than we stand at present. The servile deference to authority which rendered the greater portion of the medical profession for nearly two thousand years mere blind followers of Hippocrates and Galen has ever been the curse of the profession, and is one of its greatest curses at the present moment.

But I have said that some of the leading features of Eclecticism were older and more respectable in their origin than those of old school Allopathy. What are the great distinctive features of old school practice at the present day? They are certainly the bold use of mercury, antimony and opium, and the general addiction to Chemical remedies in preference to those of the vegetable kingdom. When did this originate? Not with Hippocrates—not with Galen—not with any of the ancients, nor did it originate in any honorable quarter. This heroic chemical medicine originated with the greatest quack that ever dishonored the medical profession, who assumed the pompous name of Plillipus Aureolus Theophrastus Paracelsus Bombastus De Hohenheim.

Paracelsus had the most unbounded arrogance—claimed to be the supreme sovereign of the medical profession—exactd the most exorbitant fees—made the most disgraceful failures—pretended to have the elixir of immortal life, and after all, died a

drunken vagabond at about 48 years of age, leaving writings which were full of absurdities.

Galenical practice, derived from Galen and Hippocrates, in opposition to the Paracelsian practice, was distinguished by preferring medicines compounded from botanical sources. But the practice adopted by the quack was of a bold and dashing character, and modern Allopathy can claim no higher origin for its peculiar distinctive features than the quack Paracelsus. It is these features which were introduced by the quack—which we would still condemn as quackery. But in doing this—in maintaining that Galen and Hippocrates were nearer right than Paracelsus, we are not following their system. It is true that so far as common sense and moral sentiment might go, Hippocrates and Galen, the leaders of medical practice for two thousand years, as well as Erasistratus and Herophilus, of the Alexandrian school, who were the originators of anatomical science, were nearer right than some of their successors; but we never quote them as authority. We would merely show that there was good common sense among the ancients, and that our modern Allopathies would be rebuked for their errors, if the spirits of Hippocrates and Galen—of Erasistratus and Herophilus, could rise before us.

Could they come back to life, Erasistratus would rebuke their use of the lancet and calomel—Hippocrates, Herophilus and Galen would rebuke their disregard of the botanic for chemical remedies. They would all disavow the present old school fraternity, as having departed widely from the true path of therapeutics. They would recognize in the Eclectic practice the same kind, liberal and courteous spirit in which they practised medicine themselves—and they would eagerly enter the Hall, to begin anew as learners, and discover how far modern medicine had transcended their ancient ideas. Herophilus was partial to a heroic practice with hellebore—but I think he would acknowledge that we have much more satisfactory remedies. Erasistratus would ask why these modern physicians persisted in using the lancet, when he had demonstrated at Smyrna the value of other measures.

What course Hippocrates would have pursued, I do not know, for his general policy was like the Eclectic except in the use of the lancet, which Erasistratus reformed, but there is a passage in his writings which shows that his rules of progress were similar to our own. He says:

“No difficulty should be made at receiving information from the most illiterate, (provided it appears that they have some knowledge of the subject under consideration.) It was thus, I think, that our art had its origin; collecting together from all quarters a body of facts. We ought not to neglect what chance may present, especially if it be reiterated, listening with attention in order to profit, and not repulsing our informant, by boasting of our own cases, and deeming his experience void of utility.”

In behalf of our ethical principles I might quote from many writers of different ages. And in behalf of our practical measures I could adduce sufficient testimony to show that while the Paracelsian errors have prevailed in the practice of the majority there has been a steady protest against these among the best men of the profession, and that in making the reform which we have accomplished, we have but done boldly and manfully what thousands have desired to see accomplished.

What are the reforms by which American Eclectics are distinguished from old schoolmen? They are eight.

1. We deny the papal infallibility of the profession.
2. We deny that it is impossible to produce satisfactory results without the lancet.
3. We deny that mercurials are ever necessary.
4. We deny the propriety of using any injurious remedies.
5. We deny that a physician should be allowed to lose more than 2 per cent.
5. We deny that we know enough of the *Materia Medica*.
6. We deny that the functions of the brain should be omitted in our systems of physiology.
8. We deny that physicians should be the last to learn new truths.

1. *As to Papal Infallibility.* I wish it to be distinctly understood by the American people that there are two parties in medicine. One contending that medical societies and medical colleges constitute a supreme tribunal which is competent to settle all questions in science, and which after it has settled them is authorized to demand acquiescence and obedience from all who do not submit—authorized to denounce all who do not agree to their decisions as empirics, quacks and enemies to the profession, against whom we should conspire to put them down. The other party like the protestants of the Reformation, denying that there is any divine right of the few to rule the many, and asserting the sacred right of private judgment and the binding duty which compels us when we know how to heal the sick, to save their lives whether we are permitted or not, by our National conventions. Upon this issue we are willing to go before an intelligent public, and I trust, gentlemen, you will not fail to explain it properly.

2. We affirm that bleeding is a barbarous and unscientific remedy, and deny that it is ever necessary. In this matter we take our stand upon the facts recognized by the highest authorities in medical literature. We refer to the most recent and accurate researches in Chemistry and pathology—to the experimental investigations of Andral, Majendie, Louis, Simon and many others which have settled beyond all doubt, and placed among the permanent facts of medical science, to be received by all medical schools of whatever therapeutic faith, the phenome-

na of the blood, when its composition has been affected by hemorrhage, by bleeding and by various other agencies.

It is indisputably established that bleeding produces a special change in the composition of the blood. The change which it produces is not a removal of any effete or morbid materials—not a removal of any element which tends to create or aggravate disease, but a removal of the most necessary and healthy portion, upon the presence of which we depend for the maintenance of health and vigor. Bleeding inevitably reduces the red or globulous portion of the blood, because it removes or destroys a certain amount of the red globules, and the loss which it produces is readily supplied by absorption of water and of comparatively crude materials, while the highly organized globules are regenerated with great slowness and difficulty.

It is a well established fact that the red globules of the blood are essential to life, and that their abundance or scarcity is a criterion of the vital force and activity of the constitution. As the proportion of the red globules increases, the general vital power rises, and the activity or energy of all the organs increases; while a diminution of their ratio enfeebles or disorders the various organs, and predisposes to nervous and tuberculous disorders, and to the whole range of adynamic and cachectic diseases. If the ratio is diminished as much as one seventh, general debility is the consequence, predisposing to disease, and diminishing the power of recovery; if as much as one fourth or more, this reduction of vital power is incompatible with health, and inevitably results in some form of disorder.

Is it not then exquisitely absurd to adopt, as a remedy in disease, a measure which, even in the most vigorous health tends directly, with rigorous precision, to destroy the vital powers and *bring on disease!* Yet this measure has been, and still is sustained by many medical men, although clinical experience, as well as chemical science, has shown its injurious effects, and thousands in America and Europe have been, and are now demonstrating, that all forms of disease may be better treated without blood-letting than with it.

We affirm that in disease, the pathogenetic elements of the blood should be removed, instead of its healthful and necessary constituents. Nature has provided for the removal of all noxious materials, by numerous appropriate outlets, which discharge everything that is injurious to human health. It is the duty of the physician to aid nature by such medicines and means as will rouse the secretions and excretions, and thus ensure the restoration of the blood to a perfectly healthy condition. When, for want of knowledge how to accomplish this, he destroys, with unnatural violence a large portion of the vital blood itself, which is as necessary to the body as its solid tissues, he acts with as much scientific precision as the savage, who would treat a case of con-

vulsions, not by removing its causes, but by cutting out a portion of the convulsed muscles.

3. We deny that mercurials are ever necessary—we affirm that we are acquainted with better medicines, and that they should, like all other inferior remedies, become obsolete.

4. We deny the necessity of using any remedies really injurious to the patient.

When you inform physicians said to be well educated in the old Colleges, that there are better and more powerful remedies than the mercurials—articles better adapted to act on the liver, and which will act on the liver when calomel totally fails, they will stare at you in astonishment, or flatly deny it. Our colleges, societies and authors are in general profoundly ignorant upon this subject—stubbornly and wilfully ignorant—ignorant as was the inquisition which condemned Galileo for maintaining the rotation of the earth—ignorant of the medicines that we employ, and of their properties—ignorant because they were educated in the mercurial system of practice, and are too sluggish or too stubborn to learn anything else.

All candid physicians will acknowledge that Paracelsus introduced a poison which has been destructive to millions; which, as Watson says, is a two edged sword. Many will acknowledge that mercurials, taking their whole history together, have done more harm than good—have poisoned or killed more than they have saved; and taking into consideration all the evils of mercury, antimony, opium, arsenic and the lancet, a large number of even the medical profession will acknowledge that medical practice, upon the whole, has been of no benefit to mankind; for the harm that it has done has been fully equal to the benefit. This was distinctly acknowledged by the leading medical authority in Great Britain—the editor of the ablest Medical Review in England—the Royal Physician, Dr. Forbes. He had the manliness and candor to acknowledge the entire failure of old school medicine, when he examined the statistics. He reasoned thus—Homœopathy is absolutely nothing, but Allopathy exhibits results which are either worse, or no better than those of Homœopathy. Consequently, Allopathy does no good in diminishing the fatality of disease; and as old medicine is a grand failure, he could only hope that something else should come on—that *YOUNG PHYSIC* should arise and restore us a benevolent science.

To this we say Amen—but *YOUNG PHYSIC* cannot be born of decrepid old parents. *Young Physic* is already born in *Young America*, and already he has thousands under his banner.

It may be startling to some to affirm that old school Allopathy is as positively useless as its leading review has admitted; but have not a great number of the most eminent physicians admitted the same? Majendie, the distinguished French physiologist, in lecturing upon the blood, took occasion to remark that he was

struck, and he supposed the members of his class were also struck with the *small amount of benefit* which the study of medicine conferred upon society. Did not our own Dr. Rush acknowledge that medicine was an unsound science, and that physicians had multiplied diseases, and increased their mortality? This is no jest upon the profession: it is a sad and honest confession. It is no speculative theory—it is a solemn and blood-stained fact. It is a fact re-affirmed every year by the reports of our own Cincinnati Commercial Hospital, under the care of the Ohio Medical College: every year it appears by their reports that of all who cross their threshold, more than one sixth pass to “the bourne whence no traveller returns.” Can any believe that one sixth of of all the cases would die if there was no physician—if they had nothing but good nurses?

Did any one ever hear of such a fatality in the ordinary course of nature, in all varieties of diseases where there were no physicians at hand to make them worse? Does not every one know that seven-eighths of our ordinary cases of disease tend to a spontaneous cure if they are only let alone? Does not every one know that where the mercurial and bleeding system is rigorously carried out, there is a great amount of disease which was produced by the medicines and the lancet? And do not all medical statistics go to prove the same thing, that the mercurial depletory practice is worse than no practice at all? Has not every system of treatment which lays aside bleeding and poisoning succeeded vastly better than the old system. Does not even Hydropathy vastly surpass it in its results? Ask enlightened patients from water-cure establishments, and they will tell you that it does. Ask such men as Bulwer, Dr. Forbes, Sir Charles Scudamore, Drs. Wilson, Gully, and others. Does not infinitesimal Homœopathy surpass it? Look at the statistics of all the Allopathic and all the Homœopathic Hospitals of Europe, collected by a learned and impartial German, Kurtz of Dessau. In these statistics we perceive that all the recorded results of old school Hospitals. for a series of years, published in an authentic and official manner, under the sanction of government, exhibit a mortality of nine or ten in every hundred cases—while the grand aggregate of nearly 30 Homœopathic Hospitals presents a mortality of but 4 or 5 in the hundred. The mortality under Allopathy being twice as great as under Homœopathy.

And how does Allopathy compare with unassisted nature? Dr. Dietl, learned German has enabled us to answer the question, by treating a larger number of cases of pneumonia with medicine and without medicine.

380 cases of pneumonia were treated; 85 by blood letting, 106 by tartar emetic in large doses, and 189 by diet and rest alone. Of those treated by blood letting—20.4 per cent. died; of those treated by large doses of tartar emetic—20.7 per cent.

died ; while of those by diet and rest only—14 or 7.4 per cent. died.

Thus while the disease alone killed 7.4 per cent., the disease assisted by tartar emetic killed nearly three times as many or 20.7 per cent ; and assisted by blood letting, it killed 20.4 per cent. Thus the intermeddling of the physician rendered the disease nearly three times as fatal as it was when let alone, and left to nature. Why were these measures so fatal ? Because they were skilfully adapted to aggravate the disease. Blood letting is calculated to render all diseases more dangerous to life ; and tartar emetic is specifically calculated to produce inflammation of the lungs if given to a man in perfect health. We have long since rejected these two remedies, and this learned German has proved in the most conclusive manner that we were right. The fever lasted longest in those who were bled, and their convalescence was the slowest. Those who had neither medicine nor the lancet had a shorter fever and a speedier convalescence.

And how does Allopathic medicine compare with a rational or Eclectic treatment ? I would only refer to the history of cholera in this city. The mortality in cholera which was acknowledged by old school physicians, varied from 20 to 50 per cent. In many cases it was more than 50 per cent. in England, and in France, under the most eminent physicians. Under the Eclectic treatment in Cincinnati fifteen hundred cases yielded but sixty-five deaths, the mortality being less than 5 per cent. The result then was five times as favorable as the best old school practice, and ten times as favorable as the worst.

What is such an antiquated and boastful system worth ?—a system boasting the accumulated learning of ages, but surpassed by an ignorant German peasant with a tub of cold water—a system surpassed by infinitesimal Homœopathy in Europe in the ratio of two to one—some of its leading measures surpassed by unassisted nature in the ratio of nearly three to one, and surpassed by a rational practice in cholera in the ratio of five to one and ten to one.

This imposition upon human credulity has lasted too long. It has been sustained by a wide spread conspiracy, and by the continual deception of the young. The facts of medical statistics are universally concealed. Not one student in five hundred ever hears of them. It is this imposition upon the young alone which sustains these antiquated errors.

But enough of this—let us look at the brighter side of the picture—at the bright future that is dawning upon our long abused profession.

5. We deny that a physician should be allowed to lose more than 2 per cent. of all classes of patients, and affirm that those who have such a mortality are behind the present development of science, and unfit to be entrusted with the public health.

6. We deny that we know enough of, or have attended sufficiently to the *materia medica*, and affirm that improvement in that department is worth all other improvements in the profession.

7. We deny that the functions of the brain should be omitted in a system of Human Physiology as is now done in medical schools, and affirm that the constitution of man cannot be understood without understanding thoroughly the seat of all his conscious vitality—his brain and nerves.

8. We hold it to be a burning disgrace that medical science and the members of the medical profession should linger in the rear of human progress, and be the last to adopt improvements and discoveries.

You know that it has been thus heretofore that the medical profession has been improved in spite of the opposition of its members. You know that as the Roman Inquisition condemned Galileo for teaching the rotation of the earth—so did the mass of the profession and its great authorities condemn the discovery of the circulation of the blood by Harvey, the discovery of vaccination by Jenner, and the discovery of the anatomy and physiology of the brain by Gall. So at the present time have they met Baron Von Reichenbach, who has made discoveries in physical and physiological science, as important as were those of Franklin in electricity; and although he is one of the most eminent and most accurate and cautious experimental chemists of Europe he has already been compelled to exclaim against the illiberality and unkindness of the medical profession, for they will not listen fairly to the philosopher who has given a scientific demonstration to animal magnetism. The discovery of the use of ether and chloroform in surgery is now established all over the world, but it is only a few years since the original discoverer attempted in vain to introduce his discovery in Boston, and was compelled to abandon it in despair.

At an early period the discoverer of the power of steam was imprisoned *a sa maniae*, and fifty years ago in this region, the discoverer of steamboats was called a madman, and up to the present time some of the greatest benefactors of medicine have been denounced as quacks and impostors; and persecution might still be the reward of every benefactor of his race. But we proclaim a new era—we have proclaimed medical independence.

And in this new era—mark my words fellow-citizens of Cincinnati!—mark my words young men of the medical profession! In this new era, the mortality from our principal prevalent diseases, will be reduced to one-fourth of what it has been.

In this new era, medicines now unknown will be brought forward, and will supercede the inferior medicines now in use.

In this new era, physicians shall differ in sentiments, and yet unite as friends in the work of benevolence.

In this new era the entire constitution of man shall be understood; the secret springs of life laid bare.

In this new era, Europe shall look westward to America for medical knowledge.

In this new era, a great American system of science, born of radicalism and freedom, shall strike down hoary falsehoods, and shall lead on this continent's high destiny.

In this new era, those great and holy, and radical truths which have been despised and trampled under foot by aristocratic combinations in government and science; those principles for which American medical reformers have been battling 20 years, will assert their power; for this is the Age of Reform.

Our movement is a part of the great movement of revolution, liberty, and progress throughout the world; it is a movement upon principles like those of John Huss, of Martin Luther, of George Washington, of the Hungarian Kossuth; a movement for the welfare of mankind—and the fate of such principles and movements, embodying the spirit of radical progress, has been described by our own poet, Gallagher, under the title *Radicalos*:

“Through the ages long and dreary,
 Since first morning dawned on Earth,
 Man has had but feeble glimpses
 Of the glory of his birth.
 Faint revealings, thwarted hopings,
 Wearying struggles day by day,—
 So the long and dreary ages
 Of his life have worn away.

But, through slow and stately marches
 Of the centuries sublime,
RADICALOS hath been strengthening
 For the noblest work of time.
 And he comes upon the Present
 Like a God in look and mien,
 With composure—high—surveying
 All the tumult of the scene.

Woe to Pride, that *now* shall scorn him;
 He will bring it fitly low,—
 Woe to the arm that shall oppose him;
 He will cleave it at a blow,—
 Woe to the hosts that shall beset him;
 He will scatter them abroad,—
 He will strike them down forever—
RADICALOS is of God!

